

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 3340 02/13/2001 Konstantinos Poulakis 041013R004 09/700,910 09/05/2003 7590 Smith Gambrell & Russel Beveridge DeGrandi **EXAMINER** Weilacher& Young Intellectual Property Group THOMAS, ALEXANDER S Suite 800 1850 M Street NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Washington, DC 20036 DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| ./ Advisory Action | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|--|------------------------|--|
| | 09/700,910 | POULAKIS, KONSTANTINOS | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Alexander S. Thomas | 1772 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the corresp ndence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 27 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | |
| a) | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | |
| NOTE: | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet. | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>4,8 and 11-16</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3 and 7</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | |
| 8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | |
| 10. Other: Ollegedy S. Sureea. ALEXANDER S. THOMAS PRIMARY EXAMINER | | | |

the objection to the disclosure for lack of drawing description and the rejection of claims 4, 8 and 11-16 in view view of the fact that the prior art does not teach applying the halogen at a reduced pressure.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Concerning the discussion of Dixon, this reference is not relied upon in the rejection. Seibel is cited to teach the use of a halogen treatment to improve adhesion to another article. Regarding the discussion of claims 3 and 7, Seibel discloses applying the halogen in a nitrogen atmosphere in view of the application of halogen in air; see Example 1 and column 1, lines 61-67.